5-1– 12
502.1, 502.9 (New), 502.10 (New)

Proposed Change as Submitted

Proponent: Kim Paarlberg, International Code Council

Revise as follows:

502.1 General. Accessible car and van parking spaces in parking lots shall comply with Sections 502.2 through 502.8. Accessible car and van parking spaces provided as part of on-street parking shall comply with Sections 502.9 through 502.10.

502.9 Parallel Parking Spaces. On-street parallel parking spaces shall comply with Section 502.9.1. On-street perpendicular of angled parking shall comply with Section 502.9.2.

502.9.1 Wide Sidewalks. Where the width of the adjacent sidewalk or available right-of-way exceeds 14 feet (4267 mm), an access aisle 60 inches (1525 mm) wide minimum shall be provided at street level the full length of the parking space and shall connect to a pedestrian access route. The access aisle shall comply with Section 502.4 and shall not encroach on the vehicular travel lane.

502.9.1.1 Alterations. In alterations where the street or sidewalk adjacent to the parking spaces is not altered, an access aisle shall not be required provided the parking spaces are located at the end of the block face.

502.9.1.2 Narrow Sidewalks. An access aisle is not required where the width of the adjacent sidewalk or the available right-of-way is less than or equal to 14 feet (4267 mm). Where an access aisle is not provided, the parking spaces shall be located at the end of the block face.

502.9.2 Perpendicular or Angled Parking Spaces. Where perpendicular or angled parking is provided, an access aisle 96 inches (2440 mm) wide minimum shall be provided at street level the full length of the parking space and shall connect to a pedestrian access route. The access aisle shall comply with Section 502.4 and shall be marked so as to discourage parking in the access aisle. Two parking spaces are permitted to share a common access aisle.

502.10 Parking Meters and Parking Pay Stations. Parking meters and parking pay stations that serve accessible parking spaces shall comply with Section 309.

502.10.1 Location. At accessible parallel parking spaces, parking meters shall be located at the head or foot of the parking space.

502.10.2 Displays and Information. Displays and information shall be visible from a point located 40 inches (1016 mm) maximum above the center of the clear space in front of the parking meter or parking pay station.

Reason: The quantity of change proposals submitted by International Code Council is reflective of three elements of our work: 1. ICC is the Secretariat for the Standard and some changes reflect inconsistencies or improvements suggested by staff; 2. ICC develops and publishes a Commentary on the standard and writing the commentary illuminates issues of the text and figures; and 3. ICC provides an interpretation service for the standard which results in the observation of provisions the users find most confusing.

The provisions from the Access Board's proposed Public Right-of-way requirements address street parking (R309). The current requirements in A117.1 really only works on a practical basis for parking lots.

502.9 (NEW)-PAARLBERG.doc

Committee Action

Approved

Committee Reason: The proposal provides standards not currently addressed in the Standard. The proposal is consistent with the Access Board's Public Rights of Way report. The Committee asked that one or more figures be added to the published Standard to illustrate the provisions.

BALLOT COMMENTS

5-1.1

Commenter: Ron Burton, Representing BOMA
Ballot: Negative with comment:

Comment: See reason on 4-42-12.

5-1.2

Commenter: Steve Orlowski, Representing NAHB
Ballot: Negative with comment:

Comment: See negative comment on proposal 4-42-12.

5-1.3

Commenter: Edward Steinfeld, Representing RESNA
Ballot: Negative with comment:

Comment: Reflecting on this proposal, I realized that 502.9.1 will often create a dangerous pedestrian condition that I observed in a local town. At an accessible on street parking location, the access aisle was at street level but it cut into the sidewalk presenting a drop off along the edge of the cut in, except at one end where the curb ramp was located. A pedestrian exiting a retail location did not notice that drop off in the middle of the sidewalk and was severely injured falling off the edge. This is a particularly bad problem for people with visual impairments. We should not be introducing unsafe conditions and causing disability in the name of accessibility. The access aisle would be safer if it was at the sidewalk elevation. 502.9.1.2 could apply to all sidewalks.

Committee Review of Comments and Action – July 2013

Approved

Committee Reason: The committee considered the information provided by the comments and decided to take no action to change its original approval of this proposal. The provisions are related to those approved in 4-42-12. The committee sustained this decision for the same reasons as the approval of 4-42.

Ballot Comments on July 2013 Committee Action Report

Ed Roether
Negative: Ballot:

Comment/reason: This issue needs further consideration. For many applications this seems appropriate, but there are other applications that raise questions of public safety. For example, means of egress in large assembly facilities incorporate the entire width of very large 'sidewalks' and the crowd of people will take up the entire width of 'sidewalk' during egress. Often times on-street parking isused for access to the ticket office during non-event times and locating the accessible parking on the nearest accessible route could mean that the access aisle would be within the means of egress, especially in

dense urban environments, raising concerns over tripping in large crowds. When considering this proposal along with other requirements would one trump the other, does public safety trump either requirement or do A117.1 requirements trump public safety?

NAHB – Steven Orlowski
Negative: Ballot:
Comment/reason: See negative comment on proposal 4-42-12.

RESNA – Edward Steinfeld
Negative: Ballot:
Comment/reason: This proposal introduces safety hazards into public sidewalks as unintended consequences. 502.9, for example, can result in tripping hazards to pedestrians. More attention to the safety implications needs to be given before adopting such requirements.

UCP – Gina Hilberry
Affirmative with Comment Ballot
Comment: I think the ballot results counts are off and it should be 42 affirmative.

5-8– 12
503.3.3

Proposed Change as Submitted

Proponent: Ed Roether, representing the ADA/A117 Harmonization Task Group and Francine Wai, Executive Director, Disability & Communication Access Board

Revise as follows:

503.3.3 Length. Access aisles shall extend the full length of the vehicle pull-up *spaces* they serve. ~~be 20 feet (6100 mm) minimum in length.~~

Reason: (**Roether)** The ADA/A117 Harmonization Task Group (HTG) was created as a task group of the A117.1 Committee to compare the 2010 ADA with the 2009 A117.1 Standard. The HTG has recommend a series of changes through a set of change proposals. The HTG is recommending changes, for the most part, address where the ADA was viewed as more stringent than the A117. Where the A117 contained provisions not addressed in the ADA, these were not considered a conflict needing action to amend the A117. In addition there are a number of places where the ADA and A117.1 are different as a result of specific actions, by the A117.1 Committee during the development of the 2009 edition, to remain or create a difference where, in the judgment of the committee the ADA was deficient. A117.1 could result in access aisles being too short in some cases.
(Wai): There may be states and counties in which the length of an accessible parking stall is required to be greater than 20 feet. By only requiring the access aisle to be a minimum of 20 feet in length, the access aisle may be situated along side an accessible stall in such a way to conflict with the use of the aisle by a vehicle lift if the length of the access aisle is not the same length as the accessible stall. Where the access aisle is 20 feet, but the accessible stall is greater than 20 feet, the access aisle would not be in compliance with the 2010 ADA Standards. The 2010 ADA Standards require the length of the access aisle to be the same length as the accessible stall.

Also, local jurisdictions may allow the length of the accessible stall to be less than 20 feet. This design of the accessible stall and access aisle would be unusual in that the access aisle would then be longer than the stall, which can affect parking lot and garage layouts.

The 2010 ADA Standards state:
503.3.2 Length. Access aisles shall extend the full length of the vehicle pull-up spaces they serve.

503.3.3-ROETHER.doc

Committee Action

Approved

Committee Reason: Provides consistency between the Standard and the 2010 ADA.

Note: The proposal was editorially revised to also strike the word 'be'.

5-13– 12
504.5.1

Proposed Change as Submitted

Proponent: Kim Paarlberg, International Code Council

Revise as follows:

504.5.1 Visual contrast. The leading 2 inches (51 mm) of the landing or tread shall have visual contrast of dark on-light or light-on-dark from the remainder of the tread.

> **EXCEPTION:** Where a stair has detectable warnings complying with Section 705 at the leading edge of each landing, visual contrast is not needed provided the detectable warnings extend the full width of the stairway and extend 24 inches minimum from the nosing.

Reason: The quantity of change proposals submitted by International Code Council is reflective of three elements of our work: 1. ICC is the Secretariat for the Standard and some changes reflect inconsistencies or improvements suggested by staff; 2. ICC develops and publishes a Commentary on the standard and writing the commentary illuminates issues of the text and figures; and 3. ICC provides an interpretation service for the standard which results in the observation of provisions the users find most confusing.

Cadence is established within two or three steps, so you do not look down at your feet. The application shown is in the Air and Space Museum in Washington D.C. This may be a good option for high traffic stairways where the contrasting stripe might be worn off, or if the stairway is patterned so that there contrasting color is in question, or in stairways where there is a requirement for photoluminescent striping also required.

Committee Action

Approval as Modified

Modification

504.5.1 Visual contrast. The leading 2 inches (51 mm) of the landing ~~or~~ and tread shall have visual contrast of dark on-light or light-on-dark from the remainder of the tread.

> ~~**EXCEPTION:** Where a stair has detectable warnings complying with Section 705 at the leading edge of each landing, visual contrast is not needed provided the detectable warnings extend the full width of the stairway and extend 24 inches minimum from the nosing.~~

Committee Reason: The Committee deleted the exception because of concerns that placing detectable warnings on a stairway landing introduces a hazard. The proposal does provide clarity by adding landings to the requirement, but it needs to be landings and treads. Landings are often the 'top step' tread of a stairway and therefore this change clarifies that, as such, landings need to be marked.

BALLOT COMMENTS

5-13.1
Commenter: Kim Paarlberg, Representing ICC
Ballot: Affirmative with comment:

Comment: The IBC requires luminous path markings on stairways in highrises. The change in the depth of the stripe will allow for those markings to also serve as the visual contrast on stairways. The added language should improve understanding and increase consistency in application. In addition, this will allow a little bit of freedom in design with no impact on the visual contrast.

Further revise as follows:

504.5.1 Visual contrast. A solid and continuous stripe shall be applied to the horizontal leading edge ~~2 inches (51 mm)~~ of the landings and each tread and shall extend the full length of the step. The stripe shall have a minimum horizontal width of 1 inch (25 mm) and a maximum width of 2 inches (51mm). The stripes shall have visual contrast of dark on-light or light-on-dark from the remainder of the tread or landing.

Proponent Comment

5-13.2

Commenter: Kim Paarlberg, Representing ICC

Further modify the proposal with the following:

504.5.1 Visual contrast. A solid and continuous stripe shall be applied to the horizontal leading edge ~~2 inches (51 mm)~~ of the landings and each tread and shall extend the full length of the step. The stripe shall have a minimum horizontal width of 1 inch (25 mm) and a maximum width of 2 inches (51mm). The leading edge of the stripe shall be placed a maximum of ½ inch (13mm) from the leading edge of the step and shall not overlap the leading edge of the step by more than ½ inch (13 mm). The stripes shall have visual contrast of dark on-light or light-on-dark from the remainder of the tread or landing.

Reason: The IBC requires luminous path markings on stairways in highrises. The change in the depth of the stripe will allow for those markings to also serve as the visual contrast on stairways. The added language should improve understanding and increase consistency in application. In addition, this will allow a little bit of freedom in design with no impact on the visual contrast.

Committee Review of Comments and Action – July 2013

Approval as Modified.

Committee Reason: The committee discussed issues of the placement of the visual contrast on steps. The committee's decision to sustain the original approval as modified supports the consensus that visual contrast is best placed at the leading edge of each step and not set back any distance. A setback from the actual edge can be visually confusing to persons of low vision and can result in missteps.

5-14– 12

504.8.1

Proposed Change as Submitted

Proponent: Kim Paarlberg, International Code Council

Revise as follows:

504.8.1 Illumination Level. Lighting facilities shall be capable of providing ~~10~~ 1 foot-candles (~~108~~ 10.8 lux) of illuminance measured at the center of tread surfaces and on landing surfaces within 24 inches (610 mm) of step nosings.

Reason: The quantity of change proposals submitted by International Code Council is reflective of three elements of our work: 1. ICC is the Secretariat for the Standard and some changes reflect inconsistencies or improvements suggested by staff; 2. ICC develops and publishes a Commentary on the standard and writing the commentary illuminates issues of the text and figures; and 3. ICC provides an interpretation service for the standard which results in the observation of provisions the users find most confusing.

The building code requires 1 footcandle for means of egress lighting. The standard to charge photoluminescent stripes requires 1 footcandle. OSHA asks for 5 footcandles for exit ways and 3 footcandles for access ways. What is the justification for 10 footcandles in ICC A117.1.

504.8 #1-PAARLBERG.doc

Committee Action

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The change is not consistent with provisions in the NFPA 101 standard. The 101 requires 10 footcandle of light when a stairway is in use, but it can be reduced to 1 footcandles at other times.

BALLOT COMMENTS

5-14.1

Commenter: Rick Lupton, Representing WABO
Ballot: Affirmative with comment:

Comment: The commentary should clarify that while this standard requires capability of 10 foot candles, the scoping code has jurisdiction of required illumination levels. 10 foot candles is a lot of wasted energy in an unoccupied stair.

Revise as follows:

5-14.2

Commenter: Allan B. Fraser, Representing NFPA
Ballot: Negative with comment:

Revise as follows:

504.8.1 Illumination Level. Lighting facilities shall be capable of providing ~~10 foot-candles (108 lux) of illuminance~~ illumination of stairs measured at the center of tread surfaces and on landing surfaces within 24 inches (610 mm) of step nosings~~.~~ as follows:

1. A 1 foot candle (10.8 lux) minimum illumination at times other than conditions of stair use
2. A 10 foot candle (108 lux) minimum illumination during conditions of stair use
3. The transition from 1 foot candle (10.8 lux) to 10 foot candle (108 lux) under conditions of stair use shall be permitted to be achieved by automatic, motion sensor-type lighting switches provided the switch controllers comply with all of the following:
   a. The switch controllers are equipped for fail-safe operation and evaluated for this purpose
   b. The motion sensor is activated by occupant movement on the stair or stair landings
   c. The illumination timers are set for a minimum 15-minute duration

The 10 ft-candle illumination currently required for stairs and stair landings needs to be retained, as lesser lighting levels make stair use too dangerous for persons with low vision and most anyone with mobility impairment. Yet, the 10 ft-candle illumination level is needed only under conditions of stair use. Illuminating stairs to the 10 ft-candle illumination level under conditions other than stair use is wasteful of natural resources and can lead to disablement of the system. It is better to permit automatic, motion sensor-type lighting switches to control the transition from 1 ft-candle to 10 ft-candle than to foolishly believe that the stair will be illuminated to the full 10 ft-candle level at all times. Once the illumination level has been increased in response to occupant movement on the stair or stair landing, the illumination level needs to be maintained for a period of 15 minutes in recognition that stair users might stop to rest on the stair and another motion detector might not pick up occupant motion until the occupant has traveled an additional stair tread or two.

The criteria proposed are well founded in the NFPA 101®, *Life Safety Code*®, a code devoted wholly to occupant life safety. The criteria proposed also respond to the Committee Reason provided for the Disapproval of 5-14– 12. The proponent of 5-14–12 should be concerned with raising the level of safety in the IBC for all stair users, rather than lowering the level of safety in ANSI A117.1 from what is currently required.

5-14.3

Commenter: Kim Paarlberg, Representing ICC
Ballot: Negative with comment:

Comment: The committee's reason states that NFPA 101 still says 10 footcandles. I have been advised that the 2012 edition of NFPA has been revised to 1 footcandle. The IBC also uses 1 footcandle for means of egress lighting. This proposal originally went in because the 10 footcandles was in NFPA 101. This A117.1 standard should be consistent.

Proponent Comment

5-14.4

Commenter: Kim Paarlberg, Representing ICC

Request the proposal be Approved as Submitted:

Reason: The committee's reason states that NFPA 101 still says 10 footcandles. I have been advised that the 2012 edition of NFPA has been revised to 1 footcandle. The IBC also uses 1 footcandle for means of egress lighting. This proposal originally went in because the 10 footcandles was in NFPA 101. This A117.1 standard should be consistent with the two main safety standards in the United States.

Committee Review of Comments and Action – July 2013

Approval with Modifications based on Comments.

Committee Reason: The committee found the proposal contained in comment 5-14.2 to provide the best standard to give people with low vision the light levels needed when they are using the stairs, and allows the light to be reduced to a minimal level when the stair isn't in use. The reduction is also an appropriate energy conservation methodology. Concern that the higher light level may not be available when people enter the stairway is addressed by the fact that the motion sensors will be activated by the doors opening into the stairway. The text not only addresses illumination levels but the controls for such lighting.

Modification

504.8.1 Illumination Level. Lighting facilities shall be capable of providing ~~10 foot-candles (108 lux) of illuminance~~ illumination of stairs measured at the center of tread surfaces and on landing surfaces within 24 inches (610 mm) of step nosings~~.~~ as follows:

1. A 1 foot candle (10.8 lux) minimum illumination at times other than conditions of stair use
2. A 10 foot candle (108 lux) minimum illumination during conditions of stair use
3. The transition from 1 foot candle (10.8 lux) to 10 foot candle (108 lux) under conditions of stair use shall be permitted to be achieved by automatic, motion sensor-type lighting switches provided the switch controllers comply with all of the following:
   a. The switch controllers are equipped for fail-safe operation and evaluated for this purpose
   b. The motion sensor is activated by occupant movement on the stair or stair landings
   c. The illumination timers are set for a minimum 15-minute duration

---

Ballot Comments on July 2013 Committee Action Report

ICC – Kim Paarlberg
Affirmative with Comment: Ballot:

Comment: The addition of new language in 504.8.1 may overlap with the existing text in 504.8.2.

5-16– 12

504.9, 504.10 (New)

Proposed Change as Submitted

Proponent: Kim Paarlberg, International Code Council

Revise as follows:

504.9 ~~Stair Level Identification~~Tactile Signage within the Stairway Enclosure. Stair level identification signs in raised characters and braille complying with Sections 703.3 and 703.4 shall be located at each floor level landing in all enclosed stairways adjacent to the door leading from the stairwell into the corridor to identify the floor level. The exit door discharging to the outside or to the level of exit discharge shall have a sign with raised characters and braille stating "EXIT."

504.10 Tactile Signage at Exits. A sign stating EXIT in raised characters and Braille and complying with Sections 703.3 and 703.4 shall be provided adjacent to each door to an *area of refuge*, an exterior area for assisted rescue, an *exit stairway*, an *exit ramp*, an *exit passageway* and the *exit discharge*.

Reason: The quantity of change proposals submitted by International Code Council is reflective of three elements of our work: 1. ICC is the Secretariat for the Standard and some changes reflect inconsistencies or improvements suggested by staff; 2. ICC develops and publishes a Commentary on the standard and writing the commentary illuminates issues of the text and figures; and 3. ICC provides an interpretation service for the standard which results in the observation of provisions the users find most confusing.

Tactile signage is required by the building code both inside and outside of the exit doors. The current provisions in 504 only address the signage within the stair tower.

1011.4 Raised character and Braille exit signs. A sign stating EXIT in raised characters and Braille and complying with ICC A117.1 shall be provided adjacent to each door to an *area of refuge*, an exterior area for assisted rescue, an *exit stairway*, an *exit ramp*, an *exit passageway* and the *exit discharge*.

1022.9 Stairway identification signs. … In addition to the *stairway* identification sign, a floor-level sign in raised characters and Braille complying with ICC A117.1 shall be located at each floor-level landing adjacent to the door leading from the *interior exit stairway* and *ramp* into the *corridor* to identify the floor level.

504.9-PAALBERG.doc

Committee Action

Approved

Committee Reason: The proposal will coordinate with the IBC. It provides useful information and should be included as a Standard requirement.

5-22– 12

506.1, 506.2 (New), 1002.9, 1002.13, 1003.9, 1003.13

Proposed Change as Submitted

Proponent: ~~Ed Roether, representing ADA/A117 Harmonization Task Group~~
Proponent: Kim Paarlberg, representing International Code Council.

STAFF NOTE – This proposal was submitted by Kim and misidentified as coming from the task group.

Revise as follows:

506.1 General. Where operable ~~Accessible~~ windows are provided in an accessible room or space, at least one shall have operable parts complying with Section 309. Operable windows required to provide natural ventilation shall have operable parts complying with Section 309. Operable windows required to provide an emergency escape and rescue openings shall have operable parts complying with Section 309.

EXCEPTIONS:

1. Operable windows that are operated only by employees are not required to comply with this section.
2. Operable windows in Type A units that comply with Section 1003.13.

506.2 Opening force. The opening force for opening operable windows shall be as follows:

1. 8.5 pounds (37.7 N) maximum for casement or horizontal sliding windows
2. 25 pounds (111 N) maximum for double hung windows

1002.9 Operable Parts. Lighting controls, electrical panelboards, electrical switches and receptacle outlets, environmental controls, appliance controls, ~~operating hardware for operable windows,~~ plumbing fixture controls, and user controls for security or intercom systems shall comply with Section 309.

EXCEPTIONS:

1. Receptacle outlets serving a dedicated use.
2. Where two or more receptacle outlets are provided in a kitchen above a length of counter top that is uninterrupted by a sink or appliance, one receptacle outlet shall not be required to comply with 309.
3. Floor receptacle outlets.
4. HVAC diffusers.
5. Controls mounted on ceiling fans.
6. Where redundant controls other than light switches are provided for a single element, one control in each space shall not be required to be accessible.
7. Reset buttons and shut-offs serving appliances, piping and plumbing fixtures.
8. Electrical panelboards shall not be required to comply with Section 309.4.

1002.13 Windows. Operable windows shall comply with Section ~~1002.13~~ 506.1.

EXCEPTIONS:

1. Windows in kitchens are not required to comply with this section.
2. Windows in bathrooms are not required to comply with this section.

~~**1002.13.1 Natural ventilation.** Operable windows required to provide natural ventilation shall comply with Sections 309.2 and 309.3.~~

~~**1002.13.2 Emergency escape.** Operable windows required to provide an emergency escape and rescue opening shall comply with Section 309.2.~~

1003.9 Operable Parts. Lighting controls, electrical panelboards, electrical switches and receptacle outlets, environmental controls, appliance controls, ~~operating hardware for operable windows,~~ plumbing fixture controls, and user controls for security or intercom systems shall comply with Section 309.

EXCEPTIONS:

1. Receptacle outlets serving a dedicated use.
2. Where two or more receptacle outlets are provided in a kitchen above a length of counter top that is uninterrupted by a sink or appliance, one receptacle outlet shall not be required to comply with Section 309.
3. Floor receptacle outlets.
4. HVAC diffusers.
5. Controls mounted on ceiling fans.
6. Where redundant controls other than light switches are provided for a single element, one control in each space shall not be required to be accessible.
7. Reset buttons and shut-offs serving appliances, piping and plumbing fixtures.
8. Electrical panelboards shall not be required to comply with Section 309.4.

1003.13 Windows. Operable windows shall comply with Section 1003.13.

1003.13.1 Natural ventilation. Operable windows required to provide natural ventilation shall comply with Sections 309.2 and 309.3.

1003.13.2 Emergency escape. Operable windows required to provide an emergency escape and rescue opening shall comply with Section 309.2.

Reason: The ADA/A117 Harmonization Task Group (HTG) was created as a task group of the A117.1 Committee to compare the 2010 ADA with the 2009 A117.1 Standard. The HTG has recommend a series of changes through a set of change proposals. The HTG is recommending changes, for the most part, address where the ADA was viewed as more stringent than the A117. Where the A117 contained provisions not addressed in the ADA, these were not considered a conflict needing action to amend the A117. In addition there are a number of places where the ADA and A117.1 are different as a result of specific actions, by the A117.1 Committee during the development of the 2009 edition, to remain or create a difference where, in the judgment of the committee the ADA was deficient.

ADA 229 Windows

> **ADA 229.1 General.** Where glazed openings are provided in *accessible* rooms or *spaces* for operation by occupants, at least one opening shall comply with 309. Each glazed opening required by an *administrative authority* to be operable shall comply with 309.
>
> **EXCEPTION:**
>
> 1. Glazed openings in *residential dwelling units* required to comply with 809 shall not be required to comply with 229.
> 2. Glazed openings in guest rooms required to provide communication features and in guest rooms required to comply with 206.5.3 shall not be required to comply with 229.

506.1 - In ICC A117.1 terminology – The exceptions are basically for Type A dwelling units and non-accessible hotel rooms. 'Operation by occupants' is basically an employee only exception. The only operable windows 'required by the administrative authority' is for ventilation or emergency escape.

506.2 – This is not coordination, but there is the question if the operable parts includes not only opening the locks and latches, but lifting the sash. The pounds force is from the window standards as a start. This could be changed to any force the committee wants. Remember last cycle that they window industry said that there was no double hung on the market that could meet the force requirements. An option would be to say that an add on could get the 5 lbs. force.

1002.9 & 1003.9 – If 1002.13 and 1003.13 is going to address windows, then window hardware should not also be in the operable parts section. This is currently how we address doors and door hardware, so that would be consistent.

1002.13 – Accessible units are required to comply with the accessible window provisions. Question – I understand that hotel rooms and dorm rooms would be operated by residents, but is the same considered for hospitals and nursing homes? Or would their windows be operated by employees? The exceptions for kitchens and bathrooms is because the window in the kitchen is typically over the sink and the window in the bathroom may be elevated for privacy or have a fixture in the immediate area. I could not find a similar exception in ADA, but this seemed logical and was in ICC A117.1 last cycle.

1003.13 – Windows in Type A units are exempted under ADA. For a total match, this would be deleted. It is shown here to see if the committee wants to match, or would prefer to exceed as currently written.

506.1-ROETHER.doc

Committee Action

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Although this proposal was labeled as coming from the Harmonization Task Group, it was quickly recognized that this was not a harmonization issue. There were concerns expressed that the proposal was, in part, a scoping provision. Some felt this was reducing accessibility below that required by the Standard. While it addressing opening force, it is silent on closing forces. There were no consensus on how bathroom and kitchen windows are addressed. At the same time there were opinions seeking clarity on the application of this provision of the Standard.

BALLOT COMMENTS

5-22.1

Commenter: Kim Paarlberg, Representing ICC
Ballot: Negative with comment:

Comment: The door and window manufactures association would like to work with the ICC A117.1 committee to develop a complete proposal for windows.

There will be a modification for this proposal.

Proponent Comments

5-22.2

Commenter: Kim Paarlberg, Representing ICC

Further revise as follows:

506.1 General. Where operable windows are provided in an accessible room or space, at least one shall be accessible and have operable parts complying with ~~Section 309~~ Sections 309.2, 309.3 and an operating force complying with Section 506.2. Where operable windows are required to provide natural ventilation ~~shall have operable parts complying with Section 309.~~ or operable windows are required to provide an emergency escape and rescue openings ~~shall have operable parts complying with Section 309~~ that window shall be the accessible operable window.

EXCEPTIONS:

1. Operable windows that are operated only by employees are not required to comply with this section.
2. Operable windows in Type A units that comply with Section 1003.13.
3. Operable skylights are not required to comply with this section.

506.2 Opening Operating force. The operating force for windows includes forces for opening, closing, locking and unlocking and shall be determined in accordance with AAMA 513. Operable parts shall be operable with one hand and shall not require tight grasping, pinching or twisting of the wrist. The force required for locking and unlocking shall be 22.5 pounds (100 N) maximum. The opening operating force for opening and closing operable windows shall be as follows:

1. 10 8.5 pounds (45 37.7 N) maximum for casement or horizontal sliding windows
2. 45 25 pounds (200 111 N) maximum for double hung windows
3. 30 pounds (135 N) for awning, hopper and projected windows
4. 25 pounds (115 N) for horizontal sliding windows

Reason: This proposal is indicated as coming from the ADA/A117 Harmonization study group. While this was discussed during the teleconferences, the timing was such that the study group did not have the opportunity to review it. Therefore, Kim Paarlberg proposed this instead. This fact was brought up during the testimony at the July meeting.

The ICC A117.1 committee was looking at appropriate forces for windows during the last cycle as well. The new requirements for wind resistance and energy efficiency has affected the weight and operation of many types of windows. For example, many homes now typically have double and triple pane glass windows instead of single pane windows that were common many years ago. While the original change was proposed by Kim Paarlberg of ICC, Kim is working with the AAMA in an effort to provide to the committee expert information on the design, construction and requirements placed on windows today.

The numbers provided in this proposal were maximum forces required based on 4580 windows tested in accordance with AAMA/WDMA/CSA 101/I.S.2/A440, as required by the IBC and IRC. The tests include four performance classes of windows and 8 operator types. The classes determined the tested window size, and is based on expected end use and common size. For example, a hung window in a high rise building would have a tested size of 59 inches x 98 inches (1500 x 2500 mm), while a hung window for a single family home would have a tested size of 40 inches x 63 inches (1000 x 1600 mm). The forces given here are based on the largest window.

A reference to the AAMA 513 standard would provide a consistent way to measure the forces required to open, close, lock and unlock many types of operable windows. This should improve compliance with whatever numbers are finally decided on.

The intent is not necessarily to set the operable window force at these proposed levels as much as it is to indicate to the committee the types of forces on these windows that exist in the current market. While there are add-ons for hung windows to reduce this force, there are not similar devices available for casement and awning type windows. The add-ons currently on the market are not very attractive, so if provided they are often removed. On the other hand, if needed by an individual, they can be added, similar to screwing up grab bars on walls where blocking is provided.

Regardless of operator type, there is additional cost incurred in providing a window that can operate with no more than 5 lbs. force. The difficulty of providing a window that can operate with no more than 5 lbs. force, the negative aesthetics and increase in cost all increase the likelihood that a fixed window will be provided instead of an operable one.

The AAMA would like the opportunity to work with the ICC A117.1 committee to establish requirements that could reasonably be met by at least a percentage of windows available on the market. The current requirement of 5 lbs. unfortunately leads to may Accessible and Type A units only having fixed windows.

5-22.3

Commenter: Kim Paarlberg, Representing ICC

Request for this portion as submitted:

1002.9 Operable Parts. Lighting controls, electrical panelboards, electrical switches and receptacle outlets, environmental controls, appliance controls, ~~operating hardware for operable windows,~~ plumbing fixture controls, and user controls for security or intercom systems shall comply with Section 309.

EXCEPTIONS:

1. Receptacle outlets serving a dedicated use.
2. Where two or more receptacle outlets are provided in a kitchen above a length of counter top that is uninterrupted by a sink or appliance, one receptacle outlet shall not be required to comply with Section 309.
3. Floor receptacle outlets.
4. HVAC diffusers.
5. Controls mounted on ceiling fans.
6. Where redundant controls other than light switches are provided for a single element, one control in each space shall not be required to be accessible.
7. Reset buttons and shut-offs serving appliances, piping and plumbing fixtures.
8. Electrical panelboards shall not be required to comply with Section 309.4.

1002.13 Windows. Operable windows shall comply with Section ~~1002.13~~ 506.1.

EXCEPTIONS:

1. Windows in kitchens are not required to comply with this section.
2. Windows in bathrooms are not required to comply with this section.

~~**1002.13.1 Natural ventilation.** Operable windows required to provide natural ventilation shall comply with Sections 309.2 and 309.3.~~

~~**1002.13.2 Emergency escape.** Operable windows required to provide an emergency escape and rescue opening shall comply with Section 309.2.~~

Reason: If we are going to deal with window hardware and opening force separately, it should be removed from the general operable parts list and dealt with in 1002.13. This would be consistent with how we handle doors.

The reference back to 506.1 would put the Accessible units in line with windows in public spaces. Requirements should be consistent regardless of what numbers are finally decided on. The exceptions for windows in kitchens is because the typical window is over the sink, and the exception for bathrooms is because windows are typically raised for privacy or over the tub. These exceptions would be consistent with what were the permitted in the 2003 ICC A117.1.

5-22.4

Commenter: Kim Paarlberg, Representing ICC

Request for this portion as submitted:

1003.9 Operable Parts. Lighting controls, electrical panelboards, electrical switches and receptacle outlets, environmental controls, appliance controls, ~~operating hardware for operable windows,~~ plumbing fixture controls, and user controls for security or intercom systems shall comply with Section 309.

EXCEPTIONS:

1. Receptacle outlets serving a dedicated use.

2. Where two or more receptacle outlets are provided in a kitchen above a length of counter top that is uninterrupted by a sink or appliance, one receptacle outlet shall not be required to comply with Section 309.
3. Floor receptacle outlets.
4. HVAC diffusers.
5. Controls mounted on ceiling fans.
6. Where redundant controls other than light switches are provided for a single element, one control in each space shall not be required to be accessible.
7. Reset buttons and shut-offs serving appliances, piping and plumbing fixtures.
8. Electrical panelboards shall not be required to comply with Section 309.4.

1003.13 Windows. Operable windows shall comply with Section 1003.13.

1003.13.1 Natural ventilation. Operable windows required to provide natural ventilation shall comply with Sections 309.2 and 309.3.

1003.13.2 Emergency escape. Operable windows required to provide an emergency escape and rescue opening shall comply with Section 309.2.

Reason: Since the committee voted last cycle to just require windows to have clear floor space and reach ranges, the operating hardware for operable windows should be removed from the general operable parts section. This would be consistent with how we handle doors and door hardware.

Committee Review of Comments and Action – July 2013

Approval with Modifications based on Comments.

Committee Reason: The committee discussed the opening force numbers for various window types provided by the industry and reflected in Comment 5-22.2. While the numbers may reflect windows currently on the market, the committee concluded that such numbers can not be considered as accessible and shouldn't be used in a minimum accessibility standard. The committee accepted the first half of comment 5-22.2 and all of comment 5-22.4 as providing clearer language for the standard. The first half of comment 5-22.2 was amended to reflect the disapproval of the 2nd half of the comment.

Modification.

506.1 General. Where operable windows are provided in an accessible room or space, at least one shall be accessible and have operable parts complying with Section 309. Where operable windows are required to provide natural ventilation ~~shall have operable parts complying with Section 309.~~ or operable windows are required to provide an emergency escape and rescue openings ~~shall have operable parts complying with Section 309~~ that window shall be the accessible operable window.

EXCEPTIONS:

1. Operable windows that are operated only by employees are not required to comply with this section.
2. Operable windows in Type A units that comply with Section 1003.13.
3. Operable skylights are not required to comply with this section.

1003.9 Operable Parts. Lighting controls, electrical panelboards, electrical switches and receptacle outlets, environmental controls, appliance controls, ~~operating hardware for operable windows,~~ plumbing fixture controls, and user controls for security or intercom systems shall comply with Section 309.

EXCEPTIONS:

1. Receptacle outlets serving a dedicated use.
2. Where two or more receptacle outlets are provided in a kitchen above a length of counter top that is uninterrupted by a sink or appliance, one receptacle outlet shall not be required to comply with Section 309.
3. Floor receptacle outlets.
4. HVAC diffusers.
5. Controls mounted on ceiling fans.
6. Where redundant controls other than light switches are provided for a single element, one control in each space shall not be required to be accessible.
7. Reset buttons and shut-offs serving appliances, piping and plumbing fixtures.
8. Electrical panelboards shall not be required to comply with Section 309.4.

1003.13 Windows. Operable windows shall comply with Section 1003.13.

1003.13.1 Natural ventilation. Operable windows required to provide natural ventilation shall comply with Sections 309.2 and 309.3.

1003.13.2 Emergency escape. Operable windows required to provide an emergency escape and rescue opening shall comply with Section 309.2.

5-23– 12
507 (New), 507.1 (New), 507.2 (New)

Proposed Change as Submitted

Proponent: Melanie J. Hughes, VA Department for the Blind and Vision Impaired, representing Association for the Education and Rehabilitation of the Blind and Visually Impaired (AER)

507. Accessible Routes Adjacent to Vehicular Drives

507.1. **Separation** Accessible routes located adjacent and parallel to vehicular drives shall be separated from the vehicular drive by one or more of the following:

1. A vertical change in level of 4 inches, minimum.
2. Barriers or railings.
3. Landscape area.

507.2 Barriers. Where parking spaces are immediately adjacent to the accessible walkway, wheelstops shall be required. Barriers used to separate an accessible route from the vehicular drive shall comply with current MUTCD requirements.

Reason: Lack of protected accessible routes to shopping centers, malls and other public spaces separated from the roadway by large parking lots present a barrier to those who are dependent upon public transportation and pedestrian modes of travel. The need to walk through parking lots to get from public transportation stops, public streets, or sidewalks, makes it difficult and unsafe for persons who have visual impairments or mobility impairments and persons of short stature, including children, to access many facilities.

507 (New)-HUGHES.doc

Committee Action

Approval as Modified

Modification

507 Accessible Routes through Parking. Where accessible routes pass through parking facilities, they shall be physically separated from vehicular traffic.

EXCEPTIONS:

1. Crossings at drive aisles shall not be required to comply with 507.
2. Parking spaces complying with 502 and passenger loading zones complying with 503 shall not be required to comply with 507.

Committee Reason: The Committee felt that this proposal addressed an issue that has been of concern for many years. It addresses a serious safety issue for the visually impaired when they need to travel from arrival points across parking lots (and facilities) in order to reach accessible entrances. The discussed and tabled the proposal multiple times to allow the proponent and interested parties to develop a solution. It will apply, to both surface parking lots and parking structures. The intent of exception #1 is to allow crosswalks that were not required to be raised. The intent of exception #2 is to allow for no obstructions between an accessible parking space and an access aisle if it happened to be along the route from another side arrival point.

BALLOT COMMENTS

5-23.1

Commenter: Ron Burton, Representing BOMA
Ballot: Affirmative with comment:

Comment: To avoid confusion by the code official, the language proposed should be accompanied by a figure to explain exactly what is intended.

5-23.2

Commenter: Gina Hilberry, Representing UCP
Ballot: Affirmative with comment:

Comment: The modification is not clear. Is this 507.3 Accessible Routes through Parking? Or is it 508? I want to be sure that 507 as written stands.

5-23.3

Commenter: David S. Collins, Representing AIA
Ballot: Negative with comment:

Comment: This is arbitrary and leaves the owner/designer without direction as to how to address this requirement. Either required or it isn't.

5-23.4

Commenter: Steve Orlowski, Representing NAHB
Ballot: Negative with comment:

Comment: The proposed language is vague in regards to where parking spaces are immediately adjacent to accessible walkways. Some walkways cross parking lots and run across the vehicular route or run parallel to the roadway. To avoid confusion by the code official, the language proposed should be accompanied by a figure to explain exactly what is intended.

5-23.5

Commenter: Kim Paarlberg, Representing ICC
Ballot: Negative with comment:

Comment: The term 'physically separated' is too broad to be uniformly enforced. I have a concern that some might interpret this as a raised sidewalk or barriers that would now allow for persons in wheelchairs to access this walkway easily. If we are going to provide a protected route, it should be useable by persons with all disabilities.

5-23.6

Commenter: Edward Steinfeld, Representing RESNA
Ballot: Negative with comment:

Comment: I am not opposed to this requirement per se but as an architect, I believe it is too restrictive in many locations without further clarification. What is a "parking facility"? In rural areas, in particular, driveways are used for parking and as pedestrian paths. This requirement could mean that a driveway used as a path of travel will need a sidewalk and curb alongside it. Also, code officials will interpret "barriers" to mean guardrails. Bollards would be sufficient in many locations. While the intent is good, more work is needed.

Proponent Comment

5-23.7

Commenter: Melanie Hughes, representing VA Department for the Blind and Vision Impaired, representing Association for the Education and Rehabilitation of the Blind and Visually Impaired (AER)

Comment: I support the committee's actions.

Committee Review of Comments and Action – July 2013

Approval as Modified.

Committee Reason: The committee considered the information provided by the comments and decided to take no action to change its original Approval as Modified for this proposal.

Ballot Comments on July 2013 Committee Action Report

ICC – Kim Paarlberg
Negative Ballot:

Comment/reason: There are two concerns –what is 'physically separated' and where this is required.

Physically separated - The approved language does not provide enough information as to how the accessible route has to be physically separated. The interpretations will not be consistent – everything from just painting on the ground to guards/walls.

Consider where in a parking garage - A route in a parking garage could be through areas other than the actual parking areas, so why would you have to separate there? Since the parking areas are effectively all drive aisles, is there a requirement there? There could also be the interpretation that this is not only the route from the accessible entrance to the parking spaces, but could also be the accessible routes required for two means of egress.

Consider where in a parking lot – Since an accessible route is required between the accessible entrance of the building and site arrival points, could this be interpreted to require a sidewalk from the entrance to connection to all sidewalks around the parking lot? How would this work with a strip mall with sidewalks on three sides?

NAHB – Steven Orlowski
Negative Ballot:

Comment/reason: As written, the approved language does not provide enough information as to the intent of where the accessible route has to be protected or physically separated from vehicular traffic where it passes through parking facilities. As we stated in our original negative ballot, the language needs to be accompanied by a figure providing an example of what the requirement intends to accomplish.

RESNA – Edward Steinfeld
Negative Ballot:
Comment/reason: The language is too general and vague to understand the intent of this proposal. What is a "crossing"? What is a "drive aisle"? What does #2 mean and why can't it be stated in plain language. There are many unintended consequences that could be introduced by this proposal.

AIA – Dave Collins
Negative Ballot
Comment/reason: I agree with ICC-Kim Paarlberg's comment. Also see additional comment added to 3-6-12.

5-24– 12
507 (NEW)

Proposed Change as Submitted

Proponent: Robert D. Feibleman, HAND Construction, representing self

Add new text as follows:

507 Fire Safety Devices

507.1 General. Fire fighting devices such as fire extinguishers, hose connections, valve controls, gauges, and annunciator panels are not required to comply with this standard.

Reason: Basic fire alarm and suppression devices are not covered by this standard. However, fire extinguishers and the like are typically located in exit corridors and mistakenly treated as a device that should comply with reach ranges. Locating them low conflicts with placement of handrails. Fire officials prefer occupants leave the building or seek shelter until rescue they do not encourage occupants to fight fires.

507 (NEW)-FEIBLEMAN.doc

Committee Action

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The Committee disapproved this proposal after expressing a variety of concerns. The first was that this may be a scoping issue and therefore should be address in the IBC and other scoping documents. This would be a blanket exemption which would allow this equipment to become protruding objects. There is nothing in the IBC or IFC that says these devices are limited to use by staff or firefighters. If the issue is compliance with operable parts, it should be addressed in Chapter 3 and not a broad exemption from the standard.

BALLOT COMMENTS

5-24.1
Commenter: Kim Paarlberg, Representing ICC
Ballot: Negative with comment:

Comment: There are many elements in a building that are intended for emergency responders (i.e., lock-boxed, elevator fire department recall, stand pipes, fire hoses, fire department communication devices in the stairway). None of these elements should be required to be within reach or meet operable parts requirements. Some facilities have trained staff that operate as emergency responders, but not all emergency responders are staff, so the exception for elements of employee work areas in the codes does not address this issue. To allow this in the standard is consistent with the allowances for doors do be controlled by security personnel. A modification could be made so that there was not an exception from the protruding objects provisions.

Replace proposal as follows:

309.1 General. Operable parts required to be accessible shall comply with Section 309.

Exception: Equipment used only for emergencies by emergency responders or emergency personnel shall not be required to comply with Section 309.

Committee Review of Comments and Action – July 2013

Approval with Modifications based on Comment.

Committee Reason: The committee discussed the need to provide an exception based on the intent of this proposal and agreed that the text of Comment 5-24.1 was an improvement over the original proposal. The committee is also concerned that the text of 5-24.1 is open to varied interpretation and needs to be refined. Perhaps definitions of some of the terms would help. The committee agreed to the revised proposal to allow further consideration during this cycle.

Replace proposal as follows:

309.1 General. Operable parts required to be accessible shall comply with Section 309.

Exception: Equipment used only for emergencies by emergency responders or emergency personnel shall not be required to comply with Section 309.

Ballot Comments on July 2013 Committee Action Report

NACS – Bradley Gaskins
Affirmative with Comment: Ballot:
Comment: The language of this proposal will still require fire extinguishers to comply and this is still an issue that needs to be addressed. We are not aware of any fire extinguishers that comply with 309. Fire extinguishers are not limited to use by emergency responders.

Jake Pauls
Negative Ballot:
Comment/reason The exception, as written, is too broad. A tighter specification of the emergency response personnel, e.g., those responding from outside the building or those specifically identified within the building's Emergency Action Plan (EAP), might help clarify that the proposal does not reduce the usability of equipment to which any occupant is intended to have access to, and use, in an emergency.

ACB – Chris Bell
Negative Ballot:
Comment/reason This exception should not be added, or should be significantly modified. Access Board staff has advised DREDF that under the IBC, firefighting equipment, including fire extinguishers, axes, and hose bibs, would not be required to meet the operating forces or to be within reach because they are not part of the building. However, fire extinguisher cabinets would be required to be within reach, and the hardware on the cabinets would be required to meet operating forces, as would fire alarm pull stations. SimplexGrinnell makes accessible fire alarm pull stations, and provides a retrofit kit for existing pull stations. These provisions enable a wide range of building occupants with disabilities to effectively utilize such equipment in case of emergency.

ATBCB – Marsha Mazz
Negative Ballot:
Comment/reason: Motion to modify as follows:

309.1 General. Operable parts required to be accessible shall comply with Section 309.

Exception: ~~Equipment~~ Firefighting devices, such as hose connections, valve controls, gauges, and annunciator panels are not required to comply with Section 309 provided that they are used only for emergencies by ~~emergency responders or~~ emergency personnel ~~shall not be required to comply with Section 309~~ acting in their official capacity.

Reason: The terms "emergency responder" and "emergency personnel" are somewhat ambiguous. Anyone who responds to an emergency can be considered an emergency responder. This proposal clarifies that the exception applies only where responders would act in an official capacity to distinguish between professional responders and ordinary building occupants. We found the list in the original proposal helpful and have incorporated it in this proposal omitting "fire extinguisher" because we believe fire extinguishers typically are provided for the use of any building occupant, not just professional responders.

DREDF – Marilyn Golden
Negative Ballot:

Comment/reason: This exception should not be added, or should be significantly modified. Access Board staff has advised DREDF that under the IBC, fire fighting equipment, including fire extinguishers, axes, and hose bibs, would not be required to meet the operating forces or to be within reach because they are not part of the building. However, fire extinguisher cabinets would be required to be within reach, and the hardware on the cabinets would be required to meet operating forces, as would fire alarm pull stations. SimplexGrinnell makes accessible fire alarm pull stations, and provides a retrofit kit for existing pull stations. These provisions enable a wide range of building occupants with disabilities to effectively utilize such equipment in case of emergency.

If an acceptable amendment appears via this ballot, DREDF may support this proposal in the next ballot, to keep it alive in the public comment draft, in order to encourage action on an amended version in January.

HUD – Cheryl Kent
Negative Ballot:

Comment/reason: The proposal added a new exception that states "Equipment used only for emergencies by emergency responders or emergency personnel shall not be required to comply with Section 309.

This exception should not be added, or should be significantly modified. It is our understanding that under the IBC, fire fighting equipment, including fire extinguishers, axes, and hose bibs, would not be required to meet the operating forces or to be within reach because they are not part of the building. However, fire extinguisher cabinets would be required to be within reach, and the hardware on the cabinets would be required to meet operating forces, as would fire alarm pull stations. SimplexGrinnell makes accessible fire alarm pull stations, and provides a retrofit kit for existing pull stations. These provisions would enable a wide range of building occupants with disabilities to effectively utilize such equipment in case of emergency.

NMGCD – Hope Reed
Negative Ballot:

Comment: Fire Extinguishers are for an EMERGENCY !!! If there is a small fire, the fire extinguisher is there to be usable by anyone in the area. Operable parts along the common-use, accessible routes need to be usable by all building occupants. If there is a larger fire, "common sense" will lead everyone outside and the **fire department will use the existing fire extinguishers and they will bring their additional equipment.**

The ***IBC-2009*** and the ***2010 ADA STANDARDS FOR ACCESSIBLE DESIGN*** are minimum requirements. The minimum requirements are not good design. Minimums only provide the framework of where a design needs to begin, and then good design evolves beyond to become a facility usable by all occupants. The New Mexico Governor's Commission on Disability (NMGCD) recommends accessible solutions that lead to inclusive or universal design.

A fire extinguisher in a cabinet and a fire extinguisher hanging on the wall are covered by ANSI-2003 section 309 Operable Parts. All fire extinguishers need to be under the same height requirements of 48" maximum to the operable parts, or top handle. We need to avoid having a different height requirement for a fire extinguisher in a cabinet versus one hanging on the wall.

The NMGCD received information from Allan Fraser, NFPA Senior Building Code Specialist. See excerpt below from **NFPA 10 – Standard for Portable Fire Extinguisher, 2013 Edition - Annex "D"** that talks about their operation and use. Allan says, "While it is always better to have anyone who might use them be trained, NFPA has never required that."

NFPA 10- Standard for Portable Fire Extinguishers, 2013 Edition

6.1.3 Placement.

6.1.3.1 Fire extinguishers shall be conspicuously located where they are readily accessible and immediately available in the event of fire.

6.1.3.2 Fire extinguishers shall be located along normal paths of travel, including exits from areas.

6.1.3.4* Portable fire extinguishers other than wheeled extinguishers shall be installed using any of the following means:

- (1) Securely on a hanger intended for the extinguisher
- (2) In the bracket supplied by the extinguisher manufacturer
- (3) In a listed bracket approved for such purpose
- (4) In cabinets or wall recesses

6.1.3.8 Installation Height.

6.1.3.8.1 Fire extinguishers having a gross weight not exceeding 40 lb (18.14 kg) shall be installed so that the top of the fire extinguisher is not more than 5 ft (1.53 m) above the floor.

6.1.3.8.2 Fire extinguishers having a gross weight greater than 40 lb (18.14 kg) (except wheeled types) shall be installed so that the top of the fire extinguisher is not more than $3\ ^{1}/_{2}$ ft (1.07 m) above the floor.

6.1.3.8.3 In no case shall the clearance between the bottom of the hand portable fire extinguisher and the floor be less than 4 in. (102 mm).

RESNA – Edward Steinfeld
Negative Ballot:

Comment/reason: This goes too far for an exception. Equipment like fire extinguishers should be within reach ranges so people capable of using it can do so.

UCP - Gina Hilberry
Negative Ballot:

Comment/reason: This appears to allow fire extinguisher cabinets to be mounted out of reach.

5-1– 13
502.9 (NEW)

Proposed Change as Submitted

Proponent: Kimberly Paarlberg, representing International Code Council.

Add new text as follows:

502 Parking Spaces

502.9 Electrical vehicle charging stations. Where an electrical vehicle charging station is provided at an accessible parking space, it shall comply with Section 502.9.

502.9.1 Operable parts. Operable parts on the charging station intended for operation by the user, including card readers, shall comply with Section 309.

502.9.2 Accessible route. An accessible route shall be provided from the access aisle adjacent to the accessible parking space to the clear floor space complying with Section 502.9.1 adjacent to the vehicle charging station. When the vehicle is being charged, the accessible route shall not be obstructed by the cable between the car and charging station.

502.9.3 Obstructions. Protection bollards, curbs or wheel stops shall be located so that they do not obstruct the clear floor space required by Section 502.9.1 or the accessible route required by Section 502.9.2.

Reason: I respectively request that the ICC A117.1 committee review possible requirements for electrical vehicle charging stations. There is a safety standard being developed for these facilities (attached). Us of these stations are open to the public. Reports I have read predict that by 2020, the electric cars will perhaps be as many as 20% of new car sales. There are even electric cars specifically designed for persons using wheelchairs (see attached article from Austin newspaper).

There was a code change proposal this last cycle to IBC to require EVSP charging stations (E184-12). While this proposal was disapproved, there is the opportunity for scoping to be proposed to the IBC next cycle.

E184 – 12
1106.6 (New)

Proponent: Alan Manche, P.E., Schneider Electric representing self

Add new text as follows:

1106.6 Electric Vehicle Charging. Where electrical vehicle charging stations are provides, and more than 250 total parking spaces are provided, not less than one accessible space shall be served with an electric vehicle charging station. An electric vehicle charging station shall serve an additional accessible parking space for each additional 500 parking spaces or fraction thereof.

(Renumber subsequent sections)

Reason: Electric Vehicle Charging Stations are currently not location restricted and may not be located near an entrance providing accessibility. This code language seeks to provide electric vehicle charging for those with accessible needs that may choose to own an electric or plug-in hybrid car. The 250 parking space trigger seeks to provide electric vehicle charging for those parking lots with a high probably of an electric vehicle visiting the location. It also seeks to ensure those needing accessible parking are able to use their electric vehicle without being challenged by the location of those chargers. It should also be noted that proper placement of an electric vehicle charging station can also provide charging for other than accessible parking spaces, hence the reason for using the term "serve."

Cost Impact: The code proposal will increase construction cost for large commercial facilities with a large parking space. The 250 parking space requirement limits cost impact to small business.

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: While accessibility to Electric Vehicle charging stations should be addressed in the code, the spirit of the ADA would require these stations for at least some of the accessible parking spaces whenever a facility choose to provide these charging stations for non-accessible spaces. The current requirements for LEED for the charging stations state that the stations have to be outside the accessible parking spaces. This possible conflict should be addressed.

When scoping requires accessible parking associated with EVSP charging stations, this will provide the technical criteria for the charging station and access to that station. This was developed after looking as guidelines set by Hawaii, California and New York. It includes basically access to the equipment and a route between the car and the station. I included card readers in the operable parts because California allows the height to be 54" in height, which is different from the reach range ICC A117.1 uses. The criteria for the access aisle and reach are the same as what is already required for accessible parking spaces and operable parts, so there is no need to repeat these requirements. There are other provisions in the California code, but they are dealing with general safety issues of the equipment, which will be covered within the EVSP standard. When the EVSP standard is finished, the ICC A117.1 committee may wish to reference it for the safety provisions similar to what we do for elevators and platform lifts.

Upon investigation of the different types of electrical cars on the market, at this time this is not a consistent location on the car where the plug in occurs. Therefore, orientation of the vehicle is not included in this proposal. I have attached pictures of charging stations and cars charging.

Committee Action – July 2013

Approval.

Committee Reason: There is a growing demand and use of electric vehicles. Charging stations for these vehicles are appearing in parking facilities and the various cities and states are developing standards for such charging facilities. While the Committee has resisted adding new proposals to its consideration during this cycle, the rapid expansion of these facilities demands the Committee address the accessibility aspects of them. The proposal was approved to generate comment and discussion during the review of the public draft. The committee will be open to revisions of the text of the proposal.